

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JAMERO MOSES, et al.,

Plaintiff,

v.

THOMAS FINCO, et al.,

Defendants.

Hon. Paul L. Maloney

Case No. 1:16-CV-248

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction. (ECF No. 31). Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), the undersigned recommends that Plaintiffs' motion be **denied**.

Injunctive relief is “an extraordinary remedy which should be granted only if . . .the circumstances clearly demand it.” *Overstreet v. Lexington-Fayette Urban County Gov't*, 305 F.3d 566, 573 (6th Cir. 2002). To obtain injunctive relief, Plaintiff must first show that he “is being threatened by some injury for which he has no adequate legal remedy.” *Dana Corp. v. Celotex Asbestos Settlement Trust*, 251 F.3d 1107, 1118 (6th Cir. 2001). If such is the case, the court must then examine several factors: (1) whether the movant is likely to prevail on the merits, (2) whether the movant would suffer irreparable injury if the court does not grant the injunction, (3) whether a preliminary injunction would cause substantial harm to others, and (4) whether a preliminary injunction would be in the public interest. *See Samuel v. Herrick Memorial Hospital*, 201 F.3d 830, 833 (6th Cir. 2000). Rather than prerequisites which must each be satisfied, the relevant factors, none of which are dispositive, are competing considerations to be weighed and balanced. *See Six Clinics Holding Corp., II v. Cafcomp*

Systems, Inc., 119 F.3d 393, 400 (6th Cir. 1997); *Michigan Bell Telephone Co. v. MFS Intelenet of Michigan, Inc.*, 16 F.Supp.2d 828, 831 (W.D.Mich. 1998). Ultimately, the decision whether to grant injunctive relief lies within the court's discretion. *See Dana Corp.*, 251 F.3d at 1118.

Plaintiffs initiated the present action alleging that they are being denied appropriate religious meals. Plaintiffs now seek an injunction ordering prison officials to provide them with the religious meals of their choosing. Plaintiffs have failed to demonstrate that they are likely to prevail on their claims. Plaintiffs have failed to establish that their legal remedies are insufficient to remedy any injury they might suffer as a result of Defendants' alleged actions. Finally, the public interest is not served by judicial interference in the management of a correctional institution in the absence of evidence justifying such. Accordingly, the undersigned recommends that Plaintiffs' motion be denied.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons articulated herein, the undersigned recommends that Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction, (ECF No. 31), be **denied**.

OBJECTIONS to this Report and Recommendation must be filed with the Clerk of Court within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this notice. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Failure to file objections within the specified time waives the right to appeal the District Court's order. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir.1981).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 11, 2017

/s/ Ellen S. Carmody
ELLEN S. CARMODY
United States Magistrate Judge